

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the present application. Claim 33 is added by the present amendment. Support for new claim 33 is found at least in original claim 29. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-32 were subject to a Restriction/Election Requirement.

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated May 30, 2007, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Claims **28**, 25, **21**, 29, 30, **31**, and 33 drawn to the method for gripping an object including a retaining aerodynamic force, an electromagnetic field rotation force, and an aerodynamic rotation force for further examination on the merits in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected invention.

Furthermore, while the Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to patentably distinct species, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Although the outstanding Official Action does not identify search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in a handful of sub-classes which fall under gripping devices. Furthermore, since electronic search is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional effort. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicant to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Additionally, there is apparent technical relationship among these inventions involving the same special technical features. Specifically, all the elected claims are aimed at "stabilizing an angular position of the detachable part by rotation thereof." Claims 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 merely define specific energy sources used to rotate the detachable part.

Claim 30 merely specifies that "an angular velocity of rotation...is reduced after mechanical engagement of the rotating detachable part...by a part of the gripping object." Thus it is believed that the elected claims sufficiently form the single general inventive concept.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-33 be conducted.

Dated: August 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Thomas K. Stine/

Thomas K. Stine

Registration No.: 32,310

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant